REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

It is asserted that these amendments do not add new matter and are supported by the specification and claims as originally filed. Entry of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 20-28 have been rejected.

Claims 20, 21 and 23 are cancelled.

Claims 21, 23 and 27 are objected to.

Claims 25, 27, and 28 are allowable.

Claims 22 and 24-28 have been amended

Claims 22 and 24-28 are pending in the application.

Claims objections:

Allowable claims 25, 27 and 28 have been amended to overcome the objections and the rejections under 35 USC 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Amended claim 22 has been amended to be dependent upon amended claim 25. Amended claim 24 has been amended to be dependent upon amended claim 22. Amended claim 26 has been amended to be dependent upon amended claim 25.

In amended claims 25, 27 and 28 the "the R_{16} anionic entity" has been replaced with "the anionic entity". Claim 23 has been canceled therefore the objection on Z_2 is now moot. In amended claim 27, R_0 is indicated as being defined above, i.e. in the formula of the unit (ES) of the silicone. Also, all the bonds of the structure (h) are now present in amended claim 27.

The rejection of claims 20-28 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, is respectfully traversed and is addressed in light of the comments below.

The Examiner is right: R₆ has to refer to formula IV and Applicant has submitted amended claims accordingly.

Amended claim 22 now only requires that Z1 comprises at least one reactive epoxy or dioxolane functional group.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner now reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 20-28 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The rejection of claims 20-22, 24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over Priou et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,703,137), is now moot because claims 20 and 21 have been canceled and claims 22, 24 and 26 have been amended to become dependent upon allowable claim 25.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is asserted that the patent application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any question concerning these remarks that would further advance prosecution of the claims to allowance, the examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (609) 860-4180. A notice of allowance is respectfully solicited.

September 19, 2003

Rhodia Inc.259 Prospect Plains Road CN7500 Cranbury, NJ 08512

RN 98131.amendment#3

Respectfully submitted,

Jean-Louis SEUGNET

Limited Recognition under 37 CFR §

10.9(b) enclosed.

Tel: (609) 860-4180 Fax: (609) 860-0503

BEFORE THE OFFICE OF ENROLLMENT AND DISCIPLINE UNITED STATE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIMITED RECOGNITION UNDER 37 CFR § 10.9(b)

Jean-Louis Seugnet is hereby given limited recognition under 37 CFR § 10.9(b), as an employee of RHODIA, INC., to prepare and prosecute patent applications wherein the assignee of record of the entire interest is RHODIA, INC. This limited recognition shall expire on the date appearing below, or when whichever of the following events first occurs prior to the date appearing below: (i) Jean-Louis Seugnet ceases to lawfully reside in the United States, (ii) Jean-Louis Seugnet's employment with RHODIA, INC. ceases or is terminated, or (iii) Jean-Louis Seugnet ceases to remain or reside in the United States on an L-1B visa.

This document constitutes proof of such limited recognition. The original of this document is on file in the Office of Enrollment and Discipline of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Expires: November 19, 2003

Harry I. Móatz

Director of Enrollment and Discipline